DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 417 783 JC 980 181

AUTHOR Rifkin, Tronie
TITLE Differences between the Professional Attitudes of Full- and Part-Time Faculty.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges, Los Angeles, CA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1998-04-27
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the American Association of Community Colleges Convention (Miami, FL, April 27, 1998).
PUB TYPE ERIC Publications (071) -- Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjunct Faculty; Attitude Measures; Community Colleges; *Comparative Analysis; Educational Attitudes; *Faculty College Relationship; *Full Time Faculty; Integrity; Knowledge Base for Teaching; *Part Time Faculty; Professional Autonomy; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Expectations of Students; Teacher Student Relationship; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

To determine the differences between the professional attitudes of full- and part-time instructors, this study was conducted on a national sample of community college faculty. The study's research design examined the attitudes expressed by faculty members on five dimensions discerned from the sociological literature on professionalism: knowledge acquisition, integration, application, and practice (scholarship); service ethic; autonomy; commitment to a calling; and integrity. Every third college listed in the 1995 American Association of Community Colleges Directory was invited to participate in the study, with a random sample of faculty chosen from participating community colleges. Surveys recorded participant attitudes toward professionalism, individual and demographic details, teaching positions, and allowed for comments. The response rate was 73%. Results suggested that part-time faculty have lower levels of involvement in knowledge acquisition and other forms of scholarship, higher expectations for students, less autonomy from the institution, and make less effort to maintain educational integrity than full-time faculty. There were no differences between full- and part-time faculty regarding service orientation to students and commitment to the occupation. Contains 40 references. (YKH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 417 783

Differences Between the Professional Attitudes of Full- and Part-Time Community College Faculty

by Tronie Rifkin
ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges
University of California, Los Angeles

Paper presented at the American Association of Community Colleges Convention
Miami, Florida
April 27, 1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Tronie Rifkin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It has been difficult for the community college professoriate and its faculty members to attain professional status within higher education. Besides Garrison (1967), who conducted a qualitative study of community college faculty at twenty colleges, Cohen and Brawer were among the first scholars to offer a national and comprehensive look at the community college professoriate and its faculty in their 1972 and 1977 quantitative studies. Among the many findings, they noted that community college faculty, at that time, lacked a coherent identity as a profession, and as professionals they were in a nascent stage of professionalization.

Most studies of the community college professoriate since the 1970s tend to describe the profession in terms of the characteristics of its faculty. That is why studies since those of Garrison (1967) and Cohen and Brawer (1977) have not captured a profile of the professional attitudes of community college faculty that provides insight into the faculty's level of professionalism. Rather, a narrow, mixed, and unclear image of the professionalism of those who teach in this sector of higher education has emerged.

In describing the degree to which community college instructors express the attitudes that distinguish them as professionals the difference between full- and part-timers needs to be addressed. In 1966, approximately 38 percent of faculty in community colleges were teaching part-time (Heinberg, 1966). By 1992, 53 percent were part-time (Cohen and Brawer, 1996), and today, the National Center of Education Statistics reports 60 percent are part-time (U.S. Department of Education, 1996). Those who support the use of part-time faculty contend that part-time faculty cost less than full-time faculty, increase institutional flexibility, and bring real

world vocational experience to the classroom (Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, 1995). Those who oppose the use of part-time faculty primarily argue that their extensive use at community colleges undermines academic integrity (Thompson, 1992). Additionally, Clark (1993) in his qualitative studies of the higher education professoriate has observed that the marginal position of part-time faculty adds "greatly to the vulnerability of academic professionals.... The part-timers are marginal in influence; their large numbers weaken the influence of full-time faculty..." (1993, p. 174).

Today, the arguments that promote the economic benefits of employing part-time faculty are hailed enthusiastically (Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, 1995). Despite the efforts of some to support the other side of the debate with studies that show part-time faculty as less effective teachers than full-time faculty (Spangler, 1990), there are no large-scale empirical studies to lend support to this side of the argument. Whether there are differences in the professional attitudes expressed by full- and part-time faculty and in what areas those differences can be found is still unclear.

According to sociologists, professionalism of the person is represented by the individual characteristics of the members of the profession--the *attitudes* that mark the members as professionals (Vollmer and Mills, 1966; Hall, 1968; Ritzer, 1973). The research design for this study examines the attitudes expressed by the members of the faculty on five dimensions discerned from the sociological literature on professionalism: (1) knowledge acquisition, integration, application, and practice (scholarship); (2) service ethic; (3) autonomy; (4) commitment to a calling; and (5) integrity. A questionnaire with scale items drawn from other studies on professionalism and other research conducted on these specific professional attitudes

was used to assess differences in the extent to which full and part-time faculty express these professional attitudes.

Theoretical Framework

The literature on professionalism suggests a combination of attitudes claimed by individual workers (Vollmer and Mills, 1966; Hall 1968; Ritzer, 1973). Attention to individual atttitudes is potentially useful to the profession in that professionalism has a personal side that concerns the individual adoption of the values and attributes transmitted by the profession.

Moore (1970), a sociologist, asserts four professional characteristics and attitudes: commitment to a calling, knowledge acquisition and application, service orientation, and autonomy. Millerson's [Kultgen, 1988] review of the professionalism literature reveals three other professional attributes: altruistic service, responsibility for one's own affairs, and client impartiality. And Greenwood (1957) suggests five attributes: systematic theory, authority, community sanction, ethical conduct, and culture. With every scholarly addition, a slightly different combination of attributes is considered essential to the professionalism of the individual.

If knowing the degree to which members of the profession express certain professional attitudes is helpful, consistent measures of these attitudes are necessary. However, few authors in the field, with the exception of Hall (1968), have attempted to resolve the problem of inconsistent measurements. Early on, Hall's (1968) interest in professionalism led him to identify five primary attitudes of professionalism and develop a scale to measure them. The five attitudes are: (1) using the professional organization as a major referent; (2) belief in public service; (3) belief in self-regulation; (4) sense of calling to the field; and (5) autonomy.

Though Hall's attitudinal dimensions of professionalism have served as the theoretical foundation for several studies over the years, the scales and the conceptual scope of the dimensions would benefit from a critical review. Several researchers have conducted psychometric evaluation of the dimensions and found several problems with the validity of the scales (Snizek, 1972; Morrow and Goetz, 1988; Kennedy and Ramsey, 1995). For example, only two of the five scales have been found to be consistent across studies: belief in self-regulation and sense of calling to the field. As a result, there remains a need for consistent measures that can assess the professional attitudes of individuals. Drawing upon the sociological literature, the five most common professional attributes of professionalism that illustrate the qualities and attitudes of a professional person were selected for this study: (1) knowledge acquisition, integration, application, and practice, (2) service ethic, (3) autonomy, (4) commitment to a calling, and (5) integrity.

The Full-Time Versus Part-Time Debate

The growing use of part-time faculty across all sectors of higher education during the last two decades is worthy of note; however, it is most dramatic in two-year institutions. Lombardi (1992) notes that in 1962 part-time instructors comprised 38.5 percent of the faculty at junior colleges. Spangler (1990) observed that within an 8 year period, between 1975 and 1983, there was a 2:1 ratio in the number of part-time to full-time positions created. Recent statistics on the number of part-time faculty in community colleges indicate that the percentage has risen to 60 percent (U.S. Department of Education, 1996).

The debate over the advantages and disadvantages of employing part-time faculty is complex with no easy answers (see Banachowski, 1996). Among the advantages are cost

savings, institutional flexibility, and the infusion of real world vocational experience into the classroom. Among the common disadvantages are loss of positions to full-time faculty and, of more serious concern, the loss of academic integrity. Clark (1993) contends that the widespread transformation of full-time posts into part-time posts *de*professionalizes the occupation. Thompson (1992) and Samuel (1989) argue that the proliferation of part-time faculty at community colleges undermines curricular development and innovation. They claim that part-time faculty tend to use traditional teaching methods and do not bring innovative methods into the classroom. On the other hand, a 1991 study conducted by Rhodes discovered that part- and full-time faculty use similar instructional styles. Moreover, the study discovered that both full- and part-time faculty share similar instructional goals and objectives for student learning.

Additional concern is voiced by critics who assert that differences in teaching styles result in part-time faculty being less effective teachers than full-time faculty. Spangler (1990) compared data from writing and examination scores of students who were enrolled in classes taught by full- and part-time instructors. She found that students taught by part-time faculty scored below those taught by full-time faculty. Concerns over the effects of differences in teaching styles are further validated by studies such as the one conducted by Fedler (1989). He found that grades awarded by part-time faculty at three schools were the highest grades awarded among all faculty members. "Fedler's study suggests that part-time faculty may inflate grades, and consequently, the students whom they teach may actually learn less than students taught by full-timers" (Banachowski, 1996, p. 8).

Contrary to the studies just mentioned, several studies conclude that differences in the quality of instruction delivered by part- and full-time faculty are negligible. The Chancellor's

Office of the California Community Colleges (CCC's) conducted an examination of faculty characteristics and the implications for instructional effectiveness of the use of part-time faculty in California's community colleges. The examination revealed inconclusive evidence of a differential academic impact on student learning between the instructional delivery of full- and part-time instructors (CCCs, 1987). Even an evaluation of student impressions of full- and part-time faculty instructional effectiveness revealed no significant differences (Sworder, 1987).

The benefits and drawbacks to the use of part-time faculty usually center around financial considerations and teaching practices. Few examine the issue from the standpoint of educational philosophy, institutional mission, and the nature of the academic profession (Cohen and Brawer, 1977). Those who support the use of part-time faculty contend that they cost less than full-time, increase institutional flexibility, and bring real world vocational experience to the classroom (Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, 1995). Those who oppose the use of part-time faculty primarily argue that the extensive use of part-time faculty at community colleges undermines academic integrity. But this claim is hard to substantiate to the extent that the nature of the community college professoriate and its professionals remains unclear. If the work of community college instructors is simply to generate credit hours, part-timers will do just as well as full-timers. Hence the question posed by Cohen and Brawer (1977): Who needs a full-time faculty?

Given the increase in the percent of part-time faculty teaching at community colleges from 43 percent in 1963 to 53 percent in 1992 (Cohen and Brawer, 1996) it is likely that the debate over their effect on academic integrity and the professionalism of full-time instructors will not abate but become amplified. The results of this study will identify similarities and

differences on individual professional attitudes between full- and part-time faculty, and these similarities and differences will inform the debate and lessen the gap in our knowledge of full-time faculty professionalism and the professional role of part-time faculty.

Methodology

To examine empirical differences in professional attitudes a national sample of community college faculty were surveyed using a questionnaire designed to assess the individual attitudes of the respondents.

Procedures

The sampling methodology used in this study is similar to the one used by Cohen and Brawer (1977) in their 1975 community college humanities faculty study. Sampling procedure was performed in two stages. The first stage selected approximately one-third (395) of the over 1,000 community colleges listed in the *1995 American Association of Community Colleges Directory* by choosing every third listing. Letters were sent to the presidents of the colleges explaining the study and inviting them to participate. The second stage of the sampling procedure involved a random sample of community college faculty from each participating college.

Materials

The Survey Instrument

The questions on the survey instrument were separated into three areas. The first set of variables represented the professional attitudes of professionalism. These variables are also the dependent variables and constituted the key variables for this study. They measure community college faculty on five attitudes of professionalism. A second set of variables represents

individual aspects of respondents such as gender, age, number of years at the college, and highest degree earned. These variables provided demographic information. The third set of questions asked respondents to provide the subject area in which they teach as well as the department or discipline, to indicate whether they are full-time or part-time, and to report their satisfaction level. The final question on the survey instrument was open-ended, offering respondents an opportunity to make additional comments.

Measures and Operational Definitions

Five professional attitudes constitute the dependent variables of the survey instrument: (1) knowledge acquisition, integration, application and practice, (2) service ethic, (3) autonomy, (4) commitment to a calling, and (5) integrity. Each attitude is represented by multiple measures designed to assess the degree of professionalism exhibited by faculty.

1. *Knowledge acquisition, integration, application, and practice* is represented by questions concerning the activities and attitudes related to curriculum and instruction, and the degree to which faculty are involved in other scholarly pursuits, or the acquisition of knowledge. Each question on both these scales asks respondents to respond either "yes" or "no."

a. Curriculum and instruction items relate to time spent in classroom activities and degree of effort spent on assessing student learning (Cohen and Brawer, 1977; Palmer 1992).

b. Other scholarly products include authoring books or articles, presenting at conferences, and developing instructional materials such as software or unpublished learning guides (Cohen and Brawer, 1977; Palmer 1992).

2. *Service ethic* includes two indicators to represent different facets of what is important to teaching--caring for students and expectations for student success. Respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree on a four point scale to items on both

measures.

a. Caring for students is described as a sense of responsibility and caring for all students as individuals (Talbert and McLaughlin, 1994).

b. Expectations for students' success is described as the belief that students are capable of learning the subject matter and succeeding (Talbert and McLaughlin, 1994).

3. *Autonomy* includes two scales that measure the autonomy from the client (in this case, students) and the autonomy from the employing organization (in this case the community college). Respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with the items on both measures.

a. Autonomy from client is conceptually defined as the relative attitudinal autonomy that individuals express with regard to their clients (students) or potential clients (students) (Forsyth and Danisiewicz, 1985).

b. Autonomy from the employing organization is conceptually defined as the relative attitudinal autonomy that individuals express with regard to the organization (institution) they work in (Forsyth and Danisiewicz, 1985).

4. *Commitment to a calling* includes one indicator. This indicator was used by Talbert and McLaughlin (1994) in their study of teacher professionalism. Respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree on a four point scale to the items concerning *Commitment to a Calling*.

a. Professional commitment is described as a commitment to teaching, the subject matter, and continued professional growth (Talbert and McLaughlin, 1994).

5. *Integrity* is measured by several questions drawn from a variety of sources. Respondents were asked to indicate how often or not they observe or carry out certain academic and institutional responsibilities.

Analyses

SAS Version 6.03 (1988) statistical software program was used for statistical analysis. The dimension scores were calculated using this statistical program. Summation of subscales provide raw scores for each professional attitude, and these raw scores were rescaled so that the mean attitude scores could be evaluated on the same scale, a scale from 0 to 100. Zero was the minimum and 100 the maximum score *possible*, rather than observed. Scaled mean scores depict where full-time and part-time community college faculty are on each attitude scale. To respond to the research question concerning differences between full- and part-time faculty on the individual dimensions, t-test analyses were performed on the scaled dimension scores.

Results

The survey yielded 1554 usable questionnaires from faculty at 127 community colleges. Of the respondents, 1,197 (77 percent) were full-time and 353 (23 percent) were part-time. Of 350 randomly selected community colleges from the American Association of Community College's (AACC) membership directory (1995), 151 community college presidents responded affirmatively to an invitation letter to participate in the study. Five colleges were dropped from the survey sample because the facilitator did not provide a course schedule from which to sample the faculty. Nine colleges received packets of questionnaires that were never distributed for reasons including: the facilitator was no longer at the institution, the packet of questionnaires never arrived, and lack of time and interest. These nine colleges were dropped from the sample of participating colleges. The final sample consisted of 127 public community colleges from 41 states.

Two thousand one-hundred and thirty questionnaires were distributed to faculty at 127 community colleges across the nation and 1560 usable questionnaires were returned. Twelve of the 1560 questionnaires were deleted from the sample due to missing data. The analyzable sample is 1554 which represents a 73 percent response rate.

Study Findings

This section turns to the research questions and corresponding hypotheses regarding the attitudes of professionalism. Is there a significant difference between the professional attitudes of full-time and part-time community college faculty? The following describes the study findings. Mean scores, t-test results, and Cohen's d effect sizes are presented in Table 1. The mean scores presented in this table for full- and part-time faculty on the scales corresponding to each professional attitude represent the extent to which full-time faculty express the individual attitudes of professionalism on a score from 0 to 100.

Table 1

Means and T-Test Results Comparing Full-Time and Part-Time Community College Faculty on the Individual Dimensions

Dimension	Full-Time Mean (n=1197)	Part-Time Mean (n=353)	t Value	Probability	Effect Size[1]
Knowledge Acquisition, etc.:					
Curriculum					
Scholarly Products	65.49	59.28	5.52	.0001	.33
	48.03	35.41	9.32	.0000	.56
Service Ethic:					
Caring for Students	77.45	77.91	-0.65	.5134	.04
Expectations for Students	50.73	52.72	-2.42	.0156	.15
Autonomy:					
From Students	55.19	54.20	1.68	.0927	.10
From the Institution	61.57	57.19	6.09	.0000	.37
Commitment to a Calling	78.75	79.07	-0.40	.6877	.02
Integrity	81.75	76.66	8.06	.0001	.50

[1] Effect size is computed using Cohen's d formula: m_2-m_1/pooled s (Cohen ,1988). Small effect=.2; Medium effect=.5; Large effect=.8.

T-test results indicate that there are significant differences between full- and part-time faculty on *Curriculum and Scholarly Products*, *Expectations for Students*, *Autonomy from the Institution*, and *Integrity*. There are no differences between full- and part-time faculty on *Caring for Students*, *Autonomy from Students*, and *Commitment to a Calling*. The findings (Table1) yield mixed evidence of significant differences between full- and part-time faculty on the individual dimensions.

Knowledge Acquisition, etc.: Curriculum and *Scholarly Products*--Full-time faculty are more involved in classroom activities and assessing student learning than part-time faculty ($t[1548]=5.52$, $p<.01$). Full-time faculty also put greater effort into authoring books, attending conferences, and creating instructional materials than part-time faculty ($t[1548]=9.32$, $p<.01$). The medium effect sizes for both measures (.40 and .56) lends further support and meaning to the significant t-values.

Service Ethic--The difference between full- and part-time faculty on the *Expectations for Students* measure was significant ($t[1548]=-2.42$, $p<.05$). Interestingly, the mean response for part-time faculty on this measure, 52.72, was greater than the mean response for full-time faculty. In other words, part-time faculty have greater expectations for student learning and achievement than full-time faculty. Though the strength of the effect for this difference is small (.15), it is a worthy difference to note. *Caring for Students*, the other *Service Ethic* measure cannot be rejected; there is no significant difference between full- and part-time faculty in this area of service. Thus, the differences between full- and part-time faculty on the *Service Ethic* scale of professionalism are mixed. However, mean responses indicate that part-time faculty may express a greater degree of professionalism on this attitude than full-time faculty, particularly with respect to student expectations for success.

Autonomy--The difference between full- and part-time faculty on the *Autonomy from the Institution* measure was significant ($t[1548]=6.09$, $p<.01$). Unlike the *Service Ethic* dimension, full-time faculty express significantly greater autonomy from the institution ($m=61.57$) than part-time faculty ($m=57.19$). The effect size is small to medium, and therefore, adds credibility to this finding. *Autonomy from Students*, the other *Autonomy* measure can not be rejected; no

significant difference emerged between full- and part-time faculty on this measure of *Autonomy*.

Commitment to a Calling--There was no significant difference between full- and part-time faculty in their commitment to their profession.

Integrity--There is a significant difference between full- and part-time faculty in the criteria they use to handle teaching, research, students, and colleagues ($t[523]=8.06$, $p<.01$). The effect size is medium--.50.

Discussion

The professional attitudes of the full- and part-time faculty were found to be significantly different on the following: *Knowledge Acquisition* (both scales, *Curriculum*, $t[1548]=5.52$, $p<.01$; and *Scholarly Products*, $t[1548]=9.32$, $p<.01$) *Service Ethic* in relation to *Expectations for Students* ($t[1548]=-2.42$, $p.05$), and *Autonomy* (dimension) *from the Institution* ($t[1548]=6.09$, $p<.01$) and *Integrity* ($t[523]=8.06$, $p<.01$).

It is not surprising to find significantly lower levels of involvement by part-time than full-time faculty in classroom activities, assessment of students, and other forms of scholarship (*Knowledge Acquisition, etc.*). Significant differences between full- and part-time faculty members on *Curriculum* are supported by literature on this topic. Monroe and Delman (1991) have argued that part-time faculty roles are ambiguous, and as a result, their teaching performance is affected. Also, Lankard (1993) says part-timers often are hired for their vocational experience and not their teaching skills. Hence, the implication is that part-time faculty are not as involved in or concerned about curriculum development and other curricular activities, such as assessing student learning, as full-time faculty.

The difference between full- and part-time faculty on *Scholarly Products* should not be taken lightly--it produced the largest effect size (.56). The part-time faculty lack of engagement in activities surrounding scholarship is largely a condition of being part-time. As a part-time faculty member, there is no need to express an interest in scholarly pursuits in the discipline or in pedagogy. Often, part-time faculty have full-time professional commitments elsewhere and therefore have little time to pursue additional activities. Ultimately, they are not an integral part of the profession and as such express less interest than full-time faculty in scholarly endeavors.

The difference between full- and part-time faculty concerning expectations for student success favored part-time faculty. T-test results indicate that part-time faculty have significantly higher expectations for students. This outcome may be due to part-time faculty lack of longevity at the institution; as a consequence they are less jaded and more idealistic than their full-time counterparts. In other words, they are less willing to resign themselves to the poor academic preparation of students and reduce their expectations of students accordingly. This finding refutes implications by some researchers that part-time faculty inflate grades (Fedler, 1989) or that instructional quality is undermined (Thompson, 1992).

Part-timer's greater lack of autonomy from the institution compared to full-timers can easily be interpreted. Part-timers have acknowledged, and in some cases expressed concern about, their apparent inferior status. Some feel they are treated as second class citizens (Kelly, 1991); others feel that institutional policies on salaries, benefits, and promotions are inequitable. In other words, part-time faculty feel they have no decision-making power within the institution, and, therefore, little autonomy.

The mean difference between full- and part-time faculty on *Integrity* was large and produced a medium effect size (.50). The items representing integrity on which high proportions of part-time faculty deviated from full-time faculty concerned maintaining good professional relationships with other faculty, participating in departmental curricular planning, and distributing performance criteria to students so that each student's grade is independent of those achieved by others. It is recognized that a couple of the questionnaire items may not have been appropriate for part-time faculty given the amount of time they are able to spend at the institution, and the lack of rights they have at most institutions to participate in certain activities such as curricular planning. Nevertheless, the disparity between full- and part-time faculty in the ethical sense of responsibility they have to their work and their institution implies that in comparison to full-time faculty, part-time faculty are not an integral part of the educational community.

There were no differences between full- and part-time community college faculty on the *Service Ethic* subscale, *Caring for Students*, on the *Autonomy* from *Students* subscale, and on the *Commitment to a Calling* scale. That the degree of professionalism expressed by part-time faculty on these three dimensions cannot be distinguished from full-time faculty is confirmed in the literature. Gappa and Leslie (1993), in their research of part-time faculty across sectors, discovered that intrinsic motivators outweighed external motivators in the decision to enter part-time teaching. The part-timers with whom they talked were "dedicated to their teaching and the constituencies they served and committed to the good of society" (p. 37). Hence, if the majority of part-time community college faculty in this study are intrinsically motivated, they are likely to be just as interested in student welfare and as committed as full-time faculty. In addition, a

taxonomy of part-timers developed by Tuckman (1978) contains a "hopeful full-timer" category. Hopeful full-timers are earnest in their devotion to the profession and thus are likely to be very student-centered and committed.

As far as *Autonomy from Students* is concerned, part-time community college faculty may be able to be as autonomous as full-time faculty but for different reasons. Whereas full-time faculty are struggling to maintain a balance between appropriate student expectations and student caring, part-time faculty by virtue of their status on campus--lack of office space, limited time on campus, etc.--are able to remain autonomous from students--simply by having less contact and interaction with them.

In summary, the professional profile of part-time faculty is distinguishable from full-time faculty along several dimensions. In comparison to full-time faculty they are significantly less involved in curriculum and instruction and scholarship, and they have less autonomy from the institution, and appear less responsible in their institutional behavior (*Integrity*). On the other hand, they have greater expectations of students and thus a higher degree of professionalism in their overall service orientation than full-time faculty. Where their professional profile is similar to that of the full-time faculty is in caring for students, their autonomy from students, and their commitment to the profession.

Conclusion

This study shows that part-time faculty differ from full-time faculty in their professional attitudes concerning scholarship (knowledge acquisition, etc.), autonomy from the institution, and integrity. Areas in which part- and full-time faculty are equally professionalized are: their service orientation to students and their commitment to the occupation, both important to the

mission and goals of the community college. The areas in which full- and part-time faculty are similar provide support for those who argue in favor of using part-time faculty. From an administration perspective, the part-time faculty service orientation to students and commitment to the occupation are useful to the community college. These traits are probably deemed more useful than other professional attributes in which full- and part-time faculty differ. Thus, differences in these areas are glossed over in favor of the others. If orientation to students and commitment to the occupation are valued above other professional attributes, then it begs the question posed by Cohen and Brawer (1977), "Who needs a full-time faculty?"

Professional differences between full- and part-time faculty in their individual attitudes toward knowledge acquisition, etc. and integrity are likely to have greater impact on the educational integrity of the institution than similarities in service orientation. Differences in professional attitudes toward knowledge mean that the part-time faculty are less involved than full-time faculty in the curricular and scholarly aspects of their teaching: fewer use a syllabus, run item analyses, distribute written measurable objectives, attend conferences, and receive funds to work on field related projects. Differences in integrity mean that part-time faculty tend to feel less of an ethical responsibility to the profession and the institution: fewer maintain office hours consistently, maintain good professional relationships with other faculty, and participate in departmental curricular planning. In other words, part-time faculty are not nearly as involved in the academic and disciplinary concerns and responsibilities of the educational community as the full-time faculty. Even though both full- and part-time faculty are equally committed to the occupation, this study suggests that the professional commitment of part-time faculty does not go beyond their interest in students to include aspects that are integral to the profession such as

curriculum, instruction, and other forms of scholarship. Whether these difference are meaningful and to what extent they affect educational philosophy and institutional mission have yet to be explored. Nonetheless, these differences do have an impact on the nature of the academic profession. If the community college is to be the nation's premier teaching institution, as proposed by the AACJC (1988), then the institution requires a majority of professionals who are integral to the system and professionally committed to teaching as a way of effecting learning, not a majority of individuals whose involvement is limited to the activity of giving lectures and correcting assignments (Cohen and Brawer, 1977).

References

American Association of Community Colleges. (1995). AACC membership directory. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. (1988). Building communities: A vision for a new century. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Banachowski, Grace. (1996). Perspectives and perceptions: The use of part-time faculty in community colleges. Community College Review, 24(2),

California Community Colleges. (1987). Study of part-time instruction. Sacramento, CA: California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 449)

Clark, Burton R. (1993). Faculty: Differentiation and dispersion. In A. Levine (Ed.), Higher learning in America: 1980-2000 (pp. 163-178). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B. (1977). The two-year college instructor today. New York: Praeger.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B. (1996). The American community college (3rd Edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.

Digranes, J. L. A., Digranes, S. H. (1995). Current and proposed uses of technology for training part-time. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 19(2), 161-169.

Fedler, F. (1989). Adjunct profs grade higher than faculty at three schools. Journalism Educator, 44(2), 32-37.

Forsyth, Patrick B., and Danisiewicz, Thomas, J. (1985). Toward a theory of professionalization. Work and Occupations, 12(1), 59-76.

Gappa, J. M., and Leslie, D. W. (1993). The invisible faculty. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.

Garrison, Roger H. (1967). Junior college faculty: Issues and problems. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 012 177)

Greenwood, E. (1957). Attributes of a profession. Social Work, 2, 44-55.

Gregory, Marshall W. (1983). Plato's protagoras: Professional models, ethical concerns. Change, 15(3), 42-45.

Hall, Richard H. (1968). Professionalization and bureaucratization. American Sociological Review, 33, 92-104.

Heinberg, S. (1966). Procedures for the supervision and evaluation of new part-time evening-division instructors in California junior colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Kelly, D. K. (1991, May). Part-time faculty in the community college: A study of their qualifications, frustrations, and involvement. Paper presented at the 31st Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 336 035)

Kennedy, Karen, N., and Ramsey, Rosemary. (1995). Psychometric evaluation of the Hall professionalism scale. Psychological Reports, 77(1), 331-338.

Kultgen, J. (1988). Ethics and professionalism. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lankard, B. A. (1993). Part-time faculty in adult and vocational education. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 363 797)

Lombardi, J. (1992). Perspectives on the community college. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and American Council on Education.

Monroe, C., and Denman, S. (1991). Assimilating adjunct faculty: Problems and opportunities. ACCA Bulletin, 77, 56-62.

Moore, Wilbert, E. (1970). The professions: roles and rules. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Morrow, Paula C., and Goetz, Joe, F., Jr. (1988). Professionalism as a form of work commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32(1), 92-111.

Palmer, James C. (1992).The scholarly activities of community college faculty: Findings of a national survey. In J. C. Palmer, and G. B. Vaughan, (Eds.), Fostering a climate for faculty scholarship at community colleges (pp. 49-65). Washington D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Pollington, M.. (1992, March). A tale of two campuses: the part-time English teacher at Brigham Young University and Utah Valley community college. Paper presented at the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Conference on College composition and Communication, Cincinnati, OH. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 345 255)

Rhodes, J. (1991). A study of instructional needs of part-time faculty at Northwestern Michigan College. MI: Ferris State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 942)

Ritzer, G. (1973). Professionalism and the individual. In E. Freidson (Ed.), The professions and their prospects (pp. 59-74). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Roueche, John E., Roueche, Suanne D., and Milliron, Mark D. (1995). Strangers in their own land. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Samuel, F. M. (1989). A strategy to eliminate inequality of higher education. Community College Review, 17(2), 41-47.

SAS Institute Inc. (1988). SAS/STAT (Version 6.03) [Computer Software]. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.

Snizek, William E. (1972). Hall's professionalism scale: An empirical reassessment. American Sociological Review, 37, 109-114.

Spangler, M. S. (1990). Part-time faculty: Recognizing an unprotected minority. Position Paper (120). Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 321 793)

Sworder, S. (1987). Determination of the effect of an instructor's employment status (full-time or part-time) on the decision of students to enroll. Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 408)

Talbert, Joan E., and McLaughlin, Milbrey W. (1994). Teacher professionalism in local school contexts. American Journal of Education, 102(2) 123-153.

Thompson, K. (1992). Recognizing mutual interests. Academe, 78(6), 22-26.

Tuckman, H. P. (1978, December). Who is part-time in academe? AAUP Bulletin, 64, 305-315.

U.S. Department of Education. (1996). 1996 digest of education statistics. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Vaughan, George B. (1992). The community college unbound. In B.W. Dziech, and W.R. Vilter (Eds.), Prisoners of elitism: The community college's struggle for stature (pp. 23-34). New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 78. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Vaughan, G. B. (1988). Scholarship in community colleges: Path to respect. Educational Record, 69(2), 217-237.

Vollmer, Howard M., and Mills, Donald L. (Eds.). (1966). Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.